

REMARKS

This Amendment A is in response to the Office Action of December 8, 2006 in which claims 1-22, 33-34 were rejected.

In the Amendment A, submitted herein, various of the original claims are changed in ways believed related only to matters of form. In particular, "characterized by/in that" is replaced with "comprising/wherein." Applicant respectfully submits that such changes are permissible per MPEP § 2111.03 (the transitional term "comprising" is synonymous with "characterized by"). Also, reference numerals/labels are removed from the claims, which change does not affect the scope of the claims per MPEP § 608.01(m) (the use of reference characters is considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims). The claims are amended to remove "step of" language.

Moreover, independent claims 1, 20 and 33 are further amended to obviate rejections of the present Office Action.

Claims 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claim 33 is amended to obviate the rejection.

Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 20-22, 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Ganton (US 6792499). Independent claim 1 is amended to add a limitation: "a double data interface configured to communicate with said processor" which is not taught by Ganton. Similar limitations are added in independent claim 20 and 33. Thus claims 1, 20 and 33 are not anticipated by Ganton.

Moreover, claims 3-4, 8, 21-22 are dependent claims of independent claims 1 or 20, respectively. Independent claims 1 and 20 are not anticipated by Ganton, as shown above. Since each of the dependent claims 3-4, 8, 21-22 narrows the scope of novel and non-obvious independent claims 1 or 20, claims 1 and 20 will compel novelty of claims 3-4, 8, 21-22. Therefore, claims 3-4, 8, 21-22 are not anticipated by Smith et al. under 35 USC 102(e).

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 3-4, 8, 21-22 is requested.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganton (US 6792499) as applied to claim 1, and in view of Lin (US 7032105).

First, the novelty of claim 2 is provided by a novelty and non-obviousness of amended claim 1 as shown above (claim 2 is a dependent claim of claim 1).

Furthermore, there are even more arguments can be made regarding the Examiner's rejection of claim 2 over Ganton in view of Lin: Lin teaches DDR DRAM 68 (see col. 4, lines 38-39 of Lin) which is volatile memory, contrary to what is taught in claim 1 and 2 of the present invention, therefore, incorporating Lin into Ganton will teach away from the invention recited in claim 2 of the present invention.

Claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganton (US 6792499) as applied to claim 1, and in view of Witek et al (US 7093153).

First, the novelty of claims 5-7 is provided by a novelty and non-obviousness of amended claim 1 as shown above (claims 5-7 are dependent claims of claim 1).

Moreover, the Applicant further disagrees with the rejection of claims 5-7 because Witek et al. do not clearly describe unique limitations of these claims, contrary to what is alleged by the Examiner. For example, regarding claim 5, Witek et al. talks about SRAM controller 161 which in general is a controller for volatile SRAM memory and not a part of the non-volatile memory as recited in claim 5 of the present invention. Therefore, combining capabilities of the SRAM controller 161 (the same is applied to the controller 162 of Witek et al.) with teaching of Ganton will teach away from the present invention of claim 5 because the controller 161 or 162 is not a part of the non-volatile memory as recited in claim 5 of the present invention. Regarding unique limitations of claims 6 and 7, the Examiner's arguments are inaccurate and Witek et al. do not disclose all unique limitations, contrary to what is alleged by the Examiner. In regard to claim 6 of the present invention, Witek et al. do not talk specifically about frequency ranges with a corresponding core voltage range, as recited in claim 6. In regard to claim 7 of the present invention, Witek et al. do not talk specifically about write protection, as recited in claim 7.

Claims 9-11, 13-18, 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganton (US 6792499) as applied to claim 1, and in view of Pua et al. (US 2005/0041473).

First, the novelty of claims 9-11, 13-18, 34 is provided by a novelty and non-obviousness of amended claim 1 and 33, as shown above (claims 9-11, 13-18, 34 are dependent claims, directly or indirectly of claim 1 and 33, respectively).

In addition, the Applicant is of opinion that Examiner's arguments are inaccurate in regard to unique limitations recited

in dependent claims 9-11, 13-18, 34. For example in claim 9, Pua et al. disclose the non-volatile memory storage integrated circuit 10 (see par. 20, lines 4-6) and does not contain "mass" memory which is further evident from the description of Pua et al.: "to easily extend the capacity of the non-volatile memory storage integrated circuit 10, by merely connecting the terminal corresponding to the SRAM IC 1411 to the desired memory terminal (see par 20 of Pua et al.). Claims 10-11, 13-18 are dependent claims of claim 9, so even further arguments in regard to unique limitations of claims 10-11, 13-18 not disclosed by the references quoted by the Examiner can be made, if requested by the Office.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganton (US 6792499), Pua et al (US 2005/0041473) as applied to claim 9, and in view of Lin (US 7032105). The Applicant refers to the remarks regarding claim 2 above.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganton (US 6792499) as applied to claim 1, and in view of Coufal et al. (IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, Vol 37 No. 11 November 1994, pp 421-424. The novelty of claim 19 is provided by a novelty and non-obviousness of amended claim 1 as shown above (claim 19 is a dependent claim of claim 1).

Furthermore, the Applicant would like to point out that in regard to all 103(a) rejections the Examiner did not show that the references he quoted contain suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the

reference or to combine reference teachings to arrive at the subject matter of corresponding claims of the present invention without the benefit of hindsight and did not demonstrate the reasonable expectation of success by combining the references, as required by MPEP paragraph 2143, and the case law.

The rejections of the Official Action of December 8, 2006, having been obviated or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage of the claims to issue is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: February 27, 2007

Anatoly Frenkel
Registration No. 54,106

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, PO Box 224
Monroe CT 06468
(203) 261-1234